



GRAFTON
Massachusetts

COPY

Natalia Alward <alwardn@graffon-ma.gov>

84 Snow Road Rear - Crown Castle Towers 06-2, LLC - Wireless Communications Facility

1 message

davidgreany@aol.com via Town of Grafton MA <cmsmailer@civicplus.com> Tue, Jul 2, 2019 at 2:35 PM
Reply-To: "davidgreany@aol.com" <cmsmailer@civicplus.com>
To: planningdept@graffon-ma.gov

Planning Board Public Comment Form
Submitted from the Town of Grafton website on Tuesday, July 2, 2019 - 2:35pm

RECEIVED

Submitted on Tuesday, July 2, 2019 - 2:35pm
Submitted by user: Anonymous
Submitted values are:

JUL - 2 2019

Select a Project: 84 Snow Road Rear - Crown Castle Towers 06-2, LLC - Wireless Communications Facility

**PLANNING BOARD
GRAFTON, MA**

First Name: David

Last Name: Li

Email Address: davidgreany@aol.com

Street Address: 25 Greany Drive

City: North Grafton

State: Massachusetts

Public Comment Disclaimer: I have read and understand the Public Comment Disclaimer.

Comments:

To whom it may concern:

EXHIBIT 14

I'm the home owner and resident at 25 Greany Drive since 1995. I love our neighborhood for all these years. My property is right behind the proposed cell tower site and they are going to open the easement next to my house to gain the access to the site. After carefully reviewed contents of the filing, I strongly oppose this project at its entirety. I hope the planning board will deny such request based on public interest and solid legal ground of our town's bylaw.

1) Not clear Crown Castel Towers arguments/facts why the existing site on India Path "no longer economically viable" and "uncertainty of unanticipated third party involvement" there. Clearly they put their "inconvenience" and economic interest over ours. Page 3.

2) Based on bylaw's "Site Selection Preference" list R20 residential district is at the very bottom in descending order. 5.8.3, Page 5. They did not provide "substantial evidence that the facility cannot, by technical necessity, feasibly be located in a non-residential zone." 5.8.5. b), Page 9. There is no justification to build the tower in our residential neighborhood.

3) The 300' set back from nearest property lines and nearest residential structure are both fell way short. 5.8.6.1 & 5.8.6.2, Page10. Such requirement is the most important and basic protection our residents have. To grant such waiver is a great breach of town's bylaw.

4) The ground level vegetation of the proposed site doesn't change the fact the size and height of the structure causes intrusion to the close and immediate residential neighborhood. Its argument the structure won't impact the property value is ludicrous to say the least.

5) There are many young children and cancer survivors including myself in the immediate residential houses, we have great health concerns especially in lieu of the request of wavier of further reduced setback requirement.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

Sincerely,
David Li